



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/062,873	01/31/2002	Jung-Hyun Kim	8021-86 (SS-15408-US)	2204

7590 03/01/2004
F. Chau & Associates, LLP
Suite 501
1900 Hempstead Turnpike
East Meadow, NY 11554

EXAMINER

CHEN, ALAN S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2182

DATE MAILED: 03/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/062,873

Applicant(s)

KIM, JUNG-HYUN

Examiner

Alan S Chen

Art Unit

2182

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the corresponding address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1/20/2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 6-14 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 January 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1 and 3-5 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Christiansen in view of applicants admitted prior art.

3. As per claim 1, Christiansen discloses a communication system (Fig. 1 and 4) which stores packet data received via a plurality of channels (Fig. 1, element 20) in a memory (Fig. 1, element 90) or transmits packet data stored in a memory through the plurality of communication channels, the communication system comprising: a plurality of buffer descriptors in which information on packet data received or transmitted via the plurality of communication channels is stored (Column 1, lines 24-32); a DMA controller which inherently can have a processing unit which stores the information on packet data in each of the plurality of buffer descriptors (Column 1, lines 40-52), and allots a flag bit (Fig. 7 and 8) to each buffer descriptor indicating whether an error occurred in packet data received via the plurality of communication channels, or whether the processing of each of the buffer descriptors is completed (Fig. 7 and 9); and a DMA controller which determines the flag bit allotted by the CPU, and according to the flag bit, stops processing a buffer descriptor currently being accessed and accesses the next buffer descriptor, or processes packet data according to information stored in buffer descriptor currently being accessed (Column 4, lines 1-12).

Art Unit: 2182

Christiansen does not disclose expressly the *central* processing unit storing the information pertaining to packet data in the buffer descriptors nor allotting a flag bit indicating the error/completion of a transfer.

Applicants admitted prior art discloses the CPU being in charge of storing and allotting bits pertaining to the buffer descriptors (page two of specification and Fig. 1 of drawings).

Christiansen and the applicant's prior art analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor in implementing DMA controllers and processing of the associated buffer descriptors.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have the CPU be in ~~charge of~~ ^{charge of} storing and allotting bits pertaining to the buffer descriptor.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to delegate specialized tasks, e.g., having a CPU mode and a DMA mode, such that modules that can handle a particular task best is delegated with that task. Hence, the CPU having the more powerful execution unit, deals with manipulation of the buffer descriptors while the DMA controller having simpler logic, deals with the handling of buffer descriptors.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Christiansen with applicants admitted prior art for the benefit of delegation of buffer descriptor tasks to improve overall system performance.

4. As per claims 3-5, Christiansen combined with applicants admitted prior art discloses the communication system of claim 1.

Christiansen does not disclose expressly a NBDP allotted by the CPU to each of the buffer descriptors and the DMA controller accessing the NBD based on an identification of the

Art Unit: 2182

NBDP allotted to the buffer descriptor currently being accessed. Christiansen also does not disclose expressly processing of the buffer descriptor sequentially by adding to the start pointer the size of the previous buffer descriptor, in essence, having a address counter.

The admitted prior art by the applicant (Fig. 1 and 2) discloses the above-mentioned function of the NBDP (Fig. 1) as well as the sequential processing of the buffer descriptors (Fig. 2).

Christiansen and the applicant's prior art analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor in implementing DMA controllers and processing of the associated buffer descriptors.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the NBDP and sequential processing of buffer descriptors.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to allow the next buffer descriptor to be stored elsewhere that is not immediately adjacent to the buffer descriptor currently being processed as well as processing buffer descriptors that are adjacent to each other. A plethora of current memory access methods allow for both contiguous and noncontiguous memory processing.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Christiansen with the prior art admitted by the applicant for the benefit of buffer descriptors processed with contiguous and noncontiguous memory.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 3-5 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 2182

6. The applicant places emphasis on the CPU having the ability to organize the buffer descriptor, as the essence of one of the limitations in claim 1 (see page 9, first paragraph). It should be noted however the limitation of claim 1 states "...whether a buffer descriptor is being organized, whether an error occurred in packet data received via the plurality of communication channels, or whether the organization of each of the buffer descriptors is completed...". Hence as long as the prior art and teaching show one of these three conditions, such as indicating an error has occurred, then it reads upon this particular limitation in claim 1.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 6-14 are allowed.

8. Claim 2 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following patents are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to DMA controllers and processor task distribution:

U.S. Pat. No. US005260942A to Auerbach et al.

U.S. Pat. No. US005859853A to Carlson

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alan S Chen whose telephone number is 703-605-0708. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30am - 5:30pm.

Art Unit: 2182

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey A Gaffin can be reached on 703-308-3301. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ASC
2/25/2004



**REHANA PERVEEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER**